UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Through Things to Persons - - - - - - - - - - *Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.*

The Validity of Liberal Religious Experience - - - - - - - - *George Lawrence Parker*

Theophilus Lindsey - - - - *Alfred Stiernotte*

Education for Moral Citizenship - - *Leo Hirsch*

Bible Belt in Cap and Gown - - - *John Malick*

Theologies Are Selected - - *Manfred A. Carter*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVI NUMBER 1

Chicago, March-April, 1950

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Manfred A. Carter: Minister of the Eddington Methodist Church, Eddington, Maine.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

John Malick: Formerly, minister of Unitarian churches in Cincinnati, Ohio, and Duluth, Minnesota.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

George Lawrence Parker: Minister of the First Congregational Parish (Unitarian), Duxbury, Massachusetts.

Alfred Stiernotte: Graduate Student, Harvard University.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 3

ARTICLES—

Through Things to Persons—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 4

The Validity of Liberal Religious Experience—GEORGE LAWRENCE PARKER 6

Theophilus Lindsey—ALFRED STIERNOTTE 9

Education for Moral Citizenship—LEO HIRSCH 10

Bible Belt in Cap and Gown—JOHN MALICK 13

Theologies Are Selected—MANFRED A. CARTER 16

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 19

THE FIELD—

John Haynes Holmes Community House 2

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

John Haynes Holmes Community House

A special tribute was paid to Dr. John Haynes Holmes, minister emeritus of The Community Church, on the occasion of the dedication of the John Haynes Holmes Community House. Peter Grimm, New York realtor, was chairman of the Honorary Dedication Committee. The dedication took place on Sunday, March 26.

According to Mr. Grimm, the Committee has undertaken to raise $135,000 which will eliminate the mortgage and equip the Community House. A part of the fund will be used to eliminate the mortgage on the church. The fund was presented to Dr. Holmes on the day of the dedication as a special feature of the ceremonies.

The John Haynes Holmes Community House, located near the church on East 35th Street, New York City, was purchased several months ago because of the increasing use of the various unique services the church offers the general public. Among the services the new center will house are the Marriage Consultation Service, directed by Dr. Abraham Stone, famed marital consultant; the Legal Counseling Service, former Judge Ralph C. Roper, director; Psychiatric Counseling Service, Dr. Frederic Feichtinger, director; Social Service Department for Personal Need and Social Adjustment, Mrs. Alice Smith, director; the Community Funeral Society; various youth activities, and the office of the Homestead Vacation Center, the summer camp sponsored by the church at Carmel, N. Y. The Reverend Maurice A. Dawkins, recently elected minister of education of the church, will be director of the Community House.

If anyone wishes to share in this gift-tribute to Dr. Holmes they may still do so by sending their contribution to Honorary Dedication Headquarters, Suite 1433, 15 West 48th Street, New York 20.

UNITY

Volume CXXXVI MARCH-APRIL, 1950 No. 1

EDITORIAL

I once stated "The Leadership of Competence" as a fundamental in a modern credo. This principle needs re-emphasizing today. The discussion technique as practiced by Forums and the Adult Education Movement, and the group process as practiced by Group Work Agencies and the Group Dynamics Movement are valuable educationally. But they cannot produce results that rise above the pooled competence of the participants, and the results are likely to represent the lowest common denominator of the group competence. Pooled ignorance of subject matter cannot produce dependable results. This, of course, is one of the hazards of democracy. The majority opinion of the general population on any given subject is almost universally short of, or at variance with, the opinion of the more sensitive and more competent. Democracy rests on the belief that in the long run, when the people are fully informed, and when the issues are clearly drawn, at least a majority will register a sound opinion. Under vigorous and competent leadership this belief may be justified. But it is a far cry from majority opinion, even when sound, to group unanimity. Competent leaders are needed to guide group processes by supplying valid information, by appealing to good motives, and by advocating excellence. Moreover, such leaders and members of groups as take competence and idealism seriously should be constantly on the alert against surrendering sound opinions for the sake of "group unanimity." Leadership that sees into the future will often find it necessary to stand on its own two feet and defy "group decisions." Wise leadership will make reasonable concessions to group opinion. But there are issues on which there can be no compromise without the loss of integrity. On such issues a genuine leader will sacrifice "unanimity" for majority opinion, and failing a majority he will go it alone until new group support can be found. In past ages the great souls looked beyond current "unanimity" and challenged majority opinion. Often this cost them status—and sometimes their lives. There is no reason to suppose that in the future progress will come about any other way, or that it will be less expensive. Leaders must take great risks and not be too much concerned about group approval.

Curtis W. Reese.

Through Things to Persons

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

One of the most familiar kinds of morality consists of living in accordance with the principles that reflect long human experience. There are certain rules of behavior, certain codes, that nearly everybody will agree to as being sound. I am thinking now of something like the Ten Commandments. We assume it as a matter of course that all wise human beings will try to live by the Ten Commandments. To turn our backs upon such obvious results of human experience is the quickest possible way for us to make fools of ourselves; and as L. P. Jacks has said: "The man who makes a fool of himself is unquestionably a knave."

But perhaps we can talk too blithely about these principles so proven by human experience. The actual form of a moral code is frequently much easier to accept than all its implications. For instance, take the rule against stealing: Thou shalt not steal. Human experience attests to the wisdom of such a rule. But how can we be sure in any number of given cases what is, and what is not, stealing? When someone appropriates something he thinks is rightfully his own, is he stealing? What is stealing? Do white men steal from black men when they perpetuate systems of job discrimination along racial lines? Do the poor steal when they vote for representatives who will pass taxation laws that "soak the rich"? Do the rich steal when they become richer on the labors of the poor?

Jesus confronted a rash man, indeed, who asserted his faithful keeping of the Ten Commandments from his youth up. We would certainly wonder if he had. Sometimes these principles of moral behavior, underscored as sound by human experience, turn out to be more like great brooms. They do a fairly adequate job of sweeping clean a large surface, but they do miss many of the smaller crumbs.

We talk a great deal of acting "according to conscience," or "according to reason." Again the principle is exceedingly valid. We should all act according to both conscience and reason. But do we always know what conscience and reason are at a given instant? Do we never mistake conscience? Are we always sure what appears to be reason is not folly? Selfishness is a good ventriloquist, it can make its voice sound remarkably like either conscience or reason.

The point of this is that we should always be prepared for difficulties when we come to apply broad moral principles to the practical concerns of life. We must take care to tuck in the many loose ends. No form of ethics is free from certain quandaries. The good life, in whatever form you conceive it, is essentially a ticklish business fraught with fine and puzzling distinctions. Courage and skill are its basic ingredients; courage to face the possibility of error; skill in the handling of life's multitude of opportunities. It was Socrates who drew from Nicias the truth that it is the "prudent acts which are courageous."

What we must forever remember about the world is that it confronts us with both persons and things. If we stand ready to survey this world of ours from whatever moral vantage point we may choose, we must take into account not one of these two realities, but both of them: things and persons. As with the old stereopticon slides it takes both sides of this picture, fused together, to give us depth of perspective. There is no question that moral codes, or principles of moral behavior, derive from human experience, and apply to persons. Yet moral codes are not persons, they are things. They have a very material quality. They are found on printed pages, or carved into granite blocks, or cast in bronze. There stands a moral code! The Ten Commandments! On the pages of millions of Bibles! Like all things, the value of this moral code is a combination of its material existence and the intelligence people exercise in observing it.

Using the example of a moral code as a "thing" reminds us of the difficulty Christianity has had with things. The Christian religion has always been reasonably sure of its emphasis on the spiritual side of life; but it has been beset with confusion as to the proper Christian attitude toward the things of the world. Jesus' statement about rendering to God what is God's and to Caesar what is Caesar's can mean many things to many people. It is extremely ambiguous and nonspecific. Christianity has generally tended to identify "things" with materialism, and has felt duty bound to call men away from attachment to the world and its material aspects. In the Middle Ages when the church was at the height of its power, this tendency toward the rejection of worldliness was strongest. "All worldly things partake of weaknesses," preached St. Augustine, and "must be rejected if man is to find happiness." In other words, man lives in a material world but he must reject it. Should this also include the church? St. Augustine does not answer.

St. Francis of Assisi is a wonderful example of Christianity's ideal of the rejection of things, and the problems it creates. St. Francis lived a life of great compassion, tenderness and joy. In order to do so he severed all his connections with the things of the world. He adopted absolute poverty; poverty and beggary became his economic way of life. To be sure he removed himself from the temptations that go with wealth; but without the seeming realization that he also assumed the existence of other men and women who continue to live under these temptations . . . otherwise, from whom would St. Francis beg? As Lewis Mumford has so well expressed it: "Man will rise above earthly things only if he has the earth to stand on." St. Francis told men to renounce property, but he worked hand in glove with the greatest property owners of his day (the officials of the church). He renounced worldly wealth . . . but bowed slavishly to the wealthiest institution of his time. The way of St. Francis, in spite of its glowing compassion, is inconsistent and confused. It is symbolic of Christianity's confusion about worldly things. That man should not be swallowed up in an idolatry of materialism is beyond dispute; but what classical Christianity has not always taken into account, nor fully understood, is man's emotional affinity with the things of the world.

For lack of a better term, let us call our attitude toward the world and its materials our "promethean urge." Prometheus, you will remember, was the god who stole fire from heaven so that it might help man to make a heaven on earth. We human beings take a special kind of pleasure in fashioning and using the

things of the earth. No matter how urgently the church has impressed upon man his obligations to become a spiritual being, man has never really been able to renounce his practical, worldly interests. Our practical habits and interests give life too much of its savor to be rejected. We enjoy things. We like to take crude materials and by skilled workmanship produce useful articles. There is something thrilling about pumping crude oil from the bowels of the earth, refining it, and using it to power automobiles and airplanes. Such conquests of the natural world are a very important part of man's psychological drives. What housewife would want to give up her washing machine? What farmer would want to renounce his tractor? Who would want to get along without inside plumbing? Where is there a person so "spiritual" that he could feel no thrill at the sight of the Hoover Dam?

There is a certain robust creativeness in our attitude toward things. We talk of the spiritual qualities of music; but great music did not come into being until men discovered a satisfactory system of notation. For a satisfactory system of notation, pen and ink and paper were needed. Now, for the widespread appreciation of music we have fine instruments, radios, and record players. These are material things. We would not care to do without them.

Our interest in things is largely responsible for our interest in work. Our need to work is something greater than just our need to earn a living. Work in its most ideal conception is freedom from conflicting impulses; it is an introduction to the real world in all its infinite variety. Ideally it should be possible to lodge morality right at the heart of the day's work. Work is always a challenge to a person to do his best all around. There may be distractions, but the challenge is always there; and it arises out of the universal desire to feel the matter of the world in our hands, where it may be put to creative use.

No one ever summed up the promethean urge in more vigorous terms than did Mark Twain when he wrote a seventieth birthday letter to Walt Whitman near the close of the last century. "You have lived just the seventy years which are the greatest in the world's history and richest in benefit and advancement to its peoples. These seventy years have done much more to widen the interval between man and the other animals than was accomplished by any of the five centuries that preceded them. Yes, you have indeed seen much . . . but tarry for a while, for the greatest is yet to come." Creativity, usefulness, progress! Such are the elements of our promethean urge! But unfortunately there are some drawbacks, too.

Walt Whitman lived for three more years after receiving Mark Twain's letter, not long enough to see some of the "greatest that was yet to come": the bombers, the flame-throwers, the poison gas, Hiroshima, Lidice, the black rage of two World Wars. This is a side to our promethean urge to give us pause. While Christianity can and has gone too far in its renunciations of the material world, materialism can also go too far in its insensible dwarfing of the human spirit. We do not necessarily disparage our promethean urge when we point out that it has lacked any real perspective on life and death. We have been practical about sewing machines and refrigerators, steel mills and assembly lines; but how practical have we been about satisfying the needs of whole human beings? What has brought on the massive confusion and frustration of modern man?

The mechanical goading of human cravings: craving for goods, craving for power, craving for sensation . . . what relationship does this have to the full satisfaction of human needs? Our promethean urge does not necessarily involve a human scale of values. That is the bitter truth of it! It can become so enraptured with its outer world that it virtually forgets the existence of an inner world. Our great mechanical age has witnessed a tragic drugging of human sensibility. Machines have no perspective on the irrational elements in human personality. What do they know or care of the mysteries we all confront as residents of this awesome universe? The answer to life's enigmas is not just to work a little harder and forget about them. Our promethean urge has a constant place as the servant of life, but never as its master. Human life created our mechanical civilization and human life must call the tune.

To be perfectly honest about it, we know that the deeper meanings of life do not call the tune in our society. We have been spiritually stunted by our promethean absorptions. Our society does not know the depth of emotion and perception that is so clearly within the capacity of human beings.

Mark Twain raved in his letter to Whitman about the steam press, the railroad, the cotton gin, the telegraph, the electric light, and surgical anesthesia. But somehow he neglected to mention that his was also the century of Goethe, Emerson, Tolstoy, Beethoven, Brahms, Renoir, and even Whitman himself. That oversight is symbolic of our overbalanced promethean urge. We satisfy our intense yearning to make, but we neglect the equally important need to learn how to use. Our manipulations of the materials of the world outstrip our spiritual interpretations of their use. Until now we have in hand, almost as if by some demonic logic, the atomic bomb, and we do not know what to do with it.

So we come back again to our twin realities, things and persons, and we ask the question: "Where should our moral action begin?" We are well aware of our responsibilities toward persons. We may not always practice what we know are the right rules of conduct toward persons, but we know what those rules are, and there is no mistaking our obligations. Still we are not so sure of our attitudes towards things. There remains the lingering suspicion that things in themselves are bad. I would question that. Persons are undoubtedly the more important, but things are undoubtedly the more accessible. Perhaps the answer to moral action is not so much to go around things as it is to go through them; perhaps in order to do our duty as moral beings we must learn to work through the medium of things, things that we can see and hear and touch, trying to make each one of them as true and as good, in its kind, as can be made.

Perhaps one of the most effective ways of promoting the spiritual excellence of persons is by improving the material excellence of things. How well we know that it is not always possible to make persons honest and compassionate by direct frontal atack upon their lives, minds, characters, and souls. But where direct contact fails, as often it must, there is still the avenue of things. We can make the things they have to do with honest. For surely we can see that there are degrees of reality in things. A structure well-built is

more of a thing than a structure poorly built. A book well and thoughtfully written is more of a thing than a pulp magazine. The music of a great composer is more of a thing than a raucous noise.

This relative value of things illustrates so well that we need not be content with things as they are. They can always be made better. We can always take a hand to things and change them by putting more value into them. By so doing we will put more value into ourselves and into other persons. Conceived along these lines things take on a new meaning; their value becomes subject to our intelligence; we become the masters of things and not the other way around. Surely we can see how such an attitude toward things could change the face of our civilization; how it would make the materials of the world not the enemies of the spiritual life, but a part of spiritual life; surely we can see, too, how this changed attitude could close the gap between our ability to produce and our ability to use.

Honest persons and honest things necessarily go together; the interdependence of persons and things in the moral world must be acknowledged. It is something to think about as we take up the day's work.

The Validity of Liberal Religious Experience

GEORGE LAWRENCE PARKER

The pressing question for liberal religious thought today is a basic one and can be framed about as follows: Is liberal religious experience valid?

Wrapped up in that question are others that cannot be separated from it, such as: Has religious liberalism a genuine experience of its own, peculiarly and affirmatively its own? Is that experience substantial, solid through and through, or is it merely a protest against other expressions of religious faith? Is liberal faith simply a progress of enlargement from something more concrete than itself, or is it a creative and fundamental activity in its own right? Is it a grafted branch on the original tree, or is it a tree which in and by itself possesses full originality and initiative? There are other challenges needing an answer but these show the drift of all of them.

Very few liberals have escaped embarrassment before the general charge of traditionalists that "you are giving up so much; how can you get along without the solid basis of doctrine underneath you?" Or, still more tragic and blush-causing: "What emotional response can you possibly get out of your mere assertion of liberty and the pursuit of truth?" The latter question implies that liberals may indeed be free, but free only in the sense that a hungry bird is free to fly abroad and dig anywhere for its food. The implication is that liberals are starved, and are running madly over the landscape, all the while neglecting the well-stocked larder of emotional supplies in the old family home.

When in my own experience my native but suppressed liberalism came to the point where an outward and professional declaration of it was the only consistent line of action, I was most seriously asked by an outstanding orthodox ministerial friend: "But what are you going to do with Christmas and Easter?" When I pointed out that Christmas as we know it is almost as much pagan as Christian, that it was not known as a church feast until three hundred years after the birth of Jesus, and that out of four Gospels only two of them, Matthew and Luke, contain any reference to Jesus' birth, my friend's surprise was great in spite of his capable scholarship. When I assured him that as a liberal I could still celebrate, privately and in public worship, the Feast of Childhood and the values therein that Jesus placed upon infancy, he gave consent but seemed scarcely satisfied.

Plainly he was approaching the celebration of Christmas from a very different pathway from my own. If I do not exaggerate, it seems fair to say that his approach was static, social, traditional, and limited, while mine was dynamic, universal, living, and unlimited. I dare to believe that my emotional thermometer registered and still registers a higher degree of heat than his.

As for Easter, I calmly pointed out to my friend that immortality is not a something created by Jesus but rather a something so ingrained in his life that death as a corruption, a dissolution and an end, could not be applied to him nor to anyone seeking to live immortally among life's temporalities. I suggested that the Resurrection Story, in spite of its intricacies and uncertainties, could not becloud my faith nor my worship at Eastertime. The physical framework of a resurrection, common to many faiths beside Christianity, could not obscure the essential truth of immortality. For me, the liberal faith called for no surrender of Easter but for an inclusion of all created things.

Here again my friend's approach and mine were along different trails. If emotional content can be measured, mine seemed to me to be more glowing than his, more flaming, more immortal indeed than his. His imagination of immortality appeared to me to be full of stops, gaps, and exceptions while mine was a continuous circuit. Mine allowed for no cooling-off places. I saw only the unhindered trend of all things toward endless life and procedures. In all creation, as in my own soul, there was and is a veritable push, rush, and continental slant toward immortality. The emotional heat of this stampede is registered by constant acceleration. As the Psalmist puts it: "My soul longeth for the courts of the Lord; when shall I appear before the presence of God!" And Robert Browning makes the element of haste essential, in his line: "It is to God I speed so fast."

This dynamic character of man's urge to permanence is far more fully expressed in the liberal attitude than elsewhere, though I would be the last to say that it is absent from any genuine expression of it. The chief difference is that in liberalism free rein is given to the sense of continuance, while in unfree thought this sense is tethered and tied to narrower ranges. There are in liberal thought no fences in or around the pasture land of immortality, but "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth, waiting for its adoption."

I have dwelt thus long on Christmas and Easter as illustrations rather than as essentials. Also because their position as dramatic highlights compels us toward the search for validity in the deeper but less spectacular

seed-beds of faith.

The very use of the word drama suggests our first clue. There is not the slightest doubt that historic orthodoxy can and does dramatize its truth and teaching in a way which liberalism cannot employ. It has a trusted repertoire of events, scenes, and occurrences which really happened or are supposed to have happened. By the repetition of these events in dramatic and pictorial stage-settings orthodoxy has, and rightly has, an instrument of appeal and a tool of influence that liberalism lacks. It must not be forgotten that drama originated in the religious field. Around the firesides of tribal devotees it was their sense of their gods and stories about them that produced the tribe's dances, plays, and stage entertainments. This tale of the picturized creed runs on from primitive beginnings to the drama of the Greeks, Aeschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles. Adopted by the Medieval Church, drama remained a child of the church until it grew up and declared its independence of ecclesiastical parenthood.

Such an instrumentality is in the main absent from the liberal development. The Miracle Play, the Mystery Play, and other like forms, are not congenial to liberalism's necessities. If we do use them we have to do so as borrowers and with a sort of apology. We may be justified in that borrowing or we may not, but we know that we are not using our native product. Liberalism indeed has a certain arsenal of dramatic material in its martyrs and heroes; that list is a long and noble one. But it was the suffering rather than the contents of their faith that supplied the dramatic element.

Omitting several connecting links, we here reach the point where the dramatic form leads us to the thought-form back of it, a thought-form which is constantly renewed by pictorial repetition. That is, the influential appeal of orthodoxy springs largely from the picture possibilities of such terms as sin, repentance, forgiveness, atonement, hell and punishment, heaven and happiness. These can be and are dramatized. From there the further steps are easy and almost unavoidable to miracle, legend, religious romance, and scenic representation of all sorts. It is all a rich treasury and one not to be denied. But liberalism may well question a process that finally substitutes dramatic form for mental and spiritual reality, and may also deny the efficacy of stage-instrumentality to meet present-day thought and needs. The footlight agency is a doubtful weapon against cynicism, despair, confusion, and moral degeneration. Against the darkness that destroys in the very noonday of man's highest achievements, the armory of scenic creedalism furnishes outdated weapons of defense. Liberalism must confess that it cannot wisely purchase these outworn surplus war goods.

Our refusal to purchase demands no apology, but our own lack of similar weapons must be acknowledged. Nevertheless, if we cannot dramatize a "way of life," "a free mind," "a temper of soul," and "salvation by character," we have the sneaking suspicion, perhaps the blatant boldness to believe, that the unstagable things are the very equipment now most needed in human society, for it is the unstagable and "unseen things that are eternal." Film faith will not stand up to our present tests. In that sense liberalism reaches the amazing discovery that without its freedoms orthodoxy would itself collapse. If liberalism has been a borrower from scenic religion, the shoe is now on the other foot.

As travellers we may be often confused; that is the lot of explorers. But in this feeling of confusion the static and dogmatic mind is evidently as much involved as is the liberal mind. Two striking expressions of this fact have recently appeared from leading orthodox sources. Both of the writers, publishing in a well-known religious journal, are teachers in established theological seminaries, one in the Midwest, one in New England. The first author, Midwest, is discussing the layman's ignorance as nourished in the average church. This is her portrait of the layman, "Mr. Brown."

> He hears [she writes] in church a great many platitudes and familiar moral exhortations which do not move him much, with now and then a sermon that gives great comfort and support to the inner life. He hears, at least in some churches, about sin, repentance, forgiveness, atonement, incarnation, redemption, eternal life, the grace of God, and the saving power of the living Christ. What this has to do with him or with the world of sharp competition and rising prices he has only the vaguest notion. That such terms stand for ideas which have a bearing on the world in which he moves six days of the week and most of the seventh would be a startling discovery. It is a discovery that he is not likely to make unless we ministers do a much better job than we have done thus far in stating the eternal truths of the Christian faith in language both simple and relevant to the layman's world.

So then, the secret is out! Here are noble terms on which orthodoxy stakes its existence but which are declared by a competent authority to be but blind alleys to the rank and file of "Mr. Browns." Evidently, by this author's genuine confession, "Mr. Brown" is in a perilous state so far as religious progress is concerned; no liberal could be in a worse state! For the designated stations which should signify, and have heretofore signified, his progressive journey are simply not any longer on the main line of travel; they are abandoned stations; traffic lies elsewhere! And it is doubtful if the author's "simple and relevant language" can restore the travel along this discarded route. A new set of stations is needed for the new directions and goals of the travelling public.

The second quotation is from a New England teacher who is discussing religious education. He writes:

> The aim of educational evangelism under the National Teaching Mission is in part an effort to evangelize children by education, instruction gauged to the level of the child's development. Commitment to Christ is sought when the individual has readiness and understanding. Conversion seems to be stressed or not with youth and adults according to the customs of the denomination concerned.

Once more the secret is out, farther than ever out! Conversion, that desideratum and sine qua non of spiritual living, cornerstone of salvation, is "stressed or not according to the customs of the denomination"! This surrender is almost shocking even to the liberal mind. Here is a custom-made conversion on the basis of take-it-or-leave-it. It is the abandonment of a key fortress which was once the protection of a mighty Kingdom! Here at last is a teacher who in all honesty says that the once pivotal outpost may be abandoned without real danger; a matter of choice after all! Even my liberalism is stirred to cry out: "O vanished glory of the Road to Damascus!"

But now to our word, experience. My point is that it is the liberal who once more may prove to be the truest experiencer of religion's great terms. For the liberal, the signal-lanterns of sin, repentance, forgiveness, and the rest are not obsolete. For him, however, they do not stand as inviolable doctrinal utterances but for soul-deep human experience. For their meanings, definitions had to be found in times and days when no

other vocabulary could be understood. As markers of the inner life of the soul in heretofore uncharted channels, they were valid. Their tragic failure came about through the theological declaration that there could never be any other vocabulary nor any other channel. And deeper tragedy still was wrought when all of these actions were ascribed to a Deity as his plan of salvation. They were decided upon in a Celestial Court irrespective of man's compliance and quite irrespective of man's future needs and history.

Here is where the cleavage comes between the free mind and the unfree mind. The free mind refuses to give final authority to definitions which are utterly alien to him, as is confessed by our Midwest teacher. But the liberal does not deny the continuing meaning of these terms as found in the field of experience. The liberal knows full well that he lives in a sinful world, and that he partakes of many of its slaveries. He knows full well that for battered spirits worn out with contests and antagonisms, there must be some such thing as healing and forgiveness. He knows that eternal life is not a myth but a burning hunger. He knows, too, that the living Christ was not created by the devotion of a few simple fishermen, nor by the theology of Paul or the Medieval Church. The devotional liberal knows that the living Christ is a reality in his own right and by his own quality; known, above all else, by the sonship to God which he recognized in all men.

If religious emotion is possible anywhere, it is just at this point. Here the capacities of our nature for exalted response are stirred to their depths; our candles burn anew with inextinguishable abandonment to God. When in childhood someone whom we looked up to said, "Why later on you can do even greater things than you see me do," we were lifted to a new emotional level, something very tremendous really happened to us. We were redeemed from our limited selves. This is exactly what Jesus said to men when he declared us to be sons of God. That redemption is fully trusted by the liberal soul.

Surely, then, the charge of low vitalism and torpid emotion cannot be brought against the liberal if he knows what Shakespeare called the Mettle of his Pasture; what Paul called "the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free."

But what of the affirmative side of liberated faith? What of its validity? Its validity must rest, in the final analysis, on the fact that it is experience in every meaning of that word. It is not an experience but experience itself in all of its totality. Every awakened soul grows weary of saying, "This is an experience; I shall pass through it somehow and, in time, come out of it." What the liberal says is quite other than this, for he says of experience: "This is something real and lasting; I hope never to come out of it." This is the liberal's conception of religion. It is all of experience taken together, not bits of separated occurrences, not a crazy quilt of discordant patches from outworn garments, not a patch of sorrow here and of joy there, not a strip of success here and a strip of failure there, but a wholeness and a unity, integral in every part. Goethe sang it in a phrase never to be forgotten: "Thus at the loom of time I ply, and weave for God the garment thou seest Him by." It is what General Jan Smuts called "Holism" in his book of twenty or more years ago. For the liberal mind faith is holism, wholeness, holiness.

To grasp this fundamental conception is experience itself, a bound-together oneness of life's flying fragments. To see this wholesomeness forever increasing is a process interpreted not by any creed but by a companionship, not by a static doctrine but by a symphonic development. All of this certifies the validity of liberal religious experience, for it is the same validity that is found in the whole of the natural universe. It makes religious faith neither unnatural nor supernatural but the most natural of all energies known to man, an addiction not an addition, an essence not an excrescence.

The second sign of the validity of such religious experience is its creative genius. It holds man fast to his first childish dream, his irrepressible desire to be always making something. Wherever else he may fail, the liberal knows that in one workshop he can never fail. Character is his artist's studio. He knows it to be always open to his creative genius and his inventive skill. Here is the validity of a task that is never finished, always demanding more and always meeting its own demand with new abilities. The efficiency required is not dictated by a creed but by a creative compulsion. Confirmed conclusions wait upon commanding clarion-calls to get on with the job! Here is validity, if anywhere. Here is what Mary Austin called, in her *Life of Jesus,* "every man's genius."

I wish I did not have to omit, except for the brief mention above, the authenticity of freedom itself as a hallmark of validity. All that I can say here is that freedom-for-something is indeed essential; but also that freedom-just-for-itself is the foundation of all other freedoms.

There is one validity that must, very briefly, be here included. It is the question that we began with: Does liberal religious experience accumulate its own material, an unwasting deposit of spiritual faith? If to accumulate a fixed sediment of truth be our goal, our reply must be mainly negative. A faith once delivered to the saints seems to us of far less value than a faith always being created by the saints. In that sense an exploring faith is far more vital than an accepted faith. Our chief religious instinct is not accumulation but exploration. The liberal lays up treasure in heaven, a new heap of wealth, just by going farther and farther on into yet unclaimed countries. He captures surprise and novelty, always expecting more surprise and novelty. He accumulates, in Santayana's phrase, infinite surmises at every turn of the journey. By his compelling and scientific method he gathers his store of inspirations. Spiritual curiosity presses him on to fill his laboratory with all that he discovers, until the very "chips of his workshop" crowd him with bursting riches.

These riches are neither rewards nor proofs, but witnesses and histories of things actually known and met. Out of these, and these only, he makes his body of doctrine, a heavily weighted treasure chest. The validity of his experience is a solid substance. And it is this accumulation that seems to hold out the promise that a self-deceived world may yet find humanity's significance a durable order of existence, called the Kingdom of God.

In the long run it may become evident that only the freedoms of liberalism in religion, in society's political life, and in science can preserve the truth gathered through the ages. It may turn out that only liberalism can save orthodoxy in any field of man's grand but baffling existence.

Theophilus Lindsey

ALFRED STIERNOTTE

Theophilus Lindsey was born in 1723, and showed high promise in his education. He graduated from the University of Cambridge with honors, and was made a Fellow of that University. He could have become a scholar, but he preferred to serve his God and his fellowmen by being a minister of the Church of England. He and his wife had a very happy time living on a small salary in the parish of Catterick. His parish comprised a large number of poor people, and he and his wife spent much of their time in trying to improve the condition of the poor, and supplying them with nursing, medicine, food, and books,—and in that way giving them the value of a practical Christianity. In 1763, he established one of the first Sunday Schools of England.

Although Theophilus Lindsey had a very happy time in his work, there was something in his duties which made his conscience very uneasy. Being a clergyman of the Church of England, he had to subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles defining the beliefs of this church. Many a modern liberal minister of the Church of England need not subscribe to these Thirty-nine Articles. He may recite them, and give them lip-service, and he may disbelieve them at the same time. But in the days of Theophilus Lindsey, the question was far different. Every candidate for the ministry in the Church of England had to subscribe to these Thirty-nine Articles, and to all things in the liturgy of the church. Part of this liturgy was the famous Athanasian Creed. It is said that an Anglican clergyman when he came to the Athanasian Creed in the service remarked: "Brethren, this is the creed of Athanasius, and God forbid it should be the creed of any other man."

In the seventeenth century, however, every minister of the Church of England, had to subscribe to these Articles. Only in 1865 was this demand relaxed, and the minister may now subscribe to "the Articles" without specifying all of them. It is also astounding for us to realize that in the seventeenth century, admissions and graduations in English universities were based upon the acceptance of these Articles. Only in 1858 were creedal requirements abolished for receiving the Bachelor's degree in Oxford University. And all such requirements for universities were abolished by Gladstone in 1871.

It is clear, therefore, that the religious picture of the seventeenth century was something quite different from that of our own days. The official religion of the seventeenth century was static, congealed, frozen into definite articles of theology. There they were, to be accepted or rejected; but if you rejected them, you were out of the church, and you had to suffer for your rejection.

Now, Theophilus Lindsey was not the only one who questioned the compression of the religious life in congealed, frozen views of religion. There were other nonconformist ministers as well, and in 1771 these ministers met in London in a place known as the Feathers' Tavern. When people go to a tavern in our own day, they do not go to discuss questions of theology or of church liturgy. But when these liberal ministers went to the Feathers' Tavern, they did so from irreproachable motives! They went there to draw up a petition to be presented to Parliament, asking Parliament to release them from subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles.

Theophilus Lindsey threw himself behind this movement, and he traveled two thousand miles to secure signatures to this petition. He determined that if the petition should fail, he would resign. The petition was presented to Parliament, and after an eight hours' debate it was rejected.

Lindsey felt that he must be true to his convictions. No longer could he go on giving lip service to complex statements of theology he did not believe. Such a procedure smacked too much of hypocrisy in his own mind. He preached his last sermon to his people, left his church, and "went out, not knowing whither he went." He had laid up nothing for a rainy day, having given all his savings to the poor of his parish.

It will be difficult for us to realize what it must have meant to Lindsey, a man of fifty, frail in health, to take this decisive step in his life, and to abandon his comfortable living, to dwell in poverty and face a future totally unknown. It was a hard struggle, but his conscience was now at peace. And a peaceful conscience meant more to him than all the wealth of the world.

He went to London with the plan of establishing a church which would carry his liberal reform in liturgy and theology. He met Dr. Joseph Priestley, a famous scientist with important connections, and Dr. Richard Price, a liberal Dissenter. These men and their friends raised funds with which to rent a vacant auction room in Essex Street. The room was cleaned up and arranged for worship. On April 17, 1774, the Essex Street Chapel was opened for worship on a distinctly Unitarian basis. It is the first really Unitarian Church of England, and this date, April 17, 1774, should remain engraved in our memory.

At this service two hundred people were present, including a member of the House of Lords, several clergymen of the Church of England, Dr. Priestley, and Dr. Benjamin Franklin, who attended regularly.

This first Unitarian service attended by two scientists, Dr. Priestley and Benjamin Franklin, is a symbol of the fact that in our liberal faith, we accept frankly the results of science and its application to human welfare. We do not give way to the popular superstition that science is an evil power. The presence of Franklin who came from the American colonies to present their interests to the then British Government, also symbolizes the growing ties between British and American Unitarians, ties which are daily being made closer and faster in the cause of freedom.

Theophilus Lindsey's church grew by leaps and bounds. Among its members were members of the nobility, members of parliament, men prominent in public life, well-known scientists, and people of wealth. The Essex Hall congregation worshipped in the same place until 1886, when they removed to Kensington. But the former location of the church in Essex Hall became the headquarters of the General Assembly of Unitarian and Free Christian Churches in England.

Lindsey was a man of many gifts. Besides moral courage, he had intellectual ability, and wrote many books on religious liberalism. He lived in a difficult period, a period facing the revolt of the American

Colonies and the French Revolution. Like his friend, Joseph Priestley, he was a liberal in politics, and he sympathized with the cause of the American Colonies and with the French Revolution. Lindsey's influence rivals that of Priestley in the rapid spread of our movement in England. Shortly after Lindsey's death in 1808, there were twenty Unitarian churches in England.

Such a man was Theophilus Lindsey, the founder of the first Unitarian Church of England—a man of moral courage, intellectual attainments, and progressive social views.

Education for Moral Citizenship

LEO HIRSCH

In a critical time like the present, when everywhere we look we find mass hysteria, ceaseless unrest whether above or below the surface, revolts, rebellions, and general strikes, rumors of wars and preparations for a Third World War, the most inhuman prejudices, bigotries, hatreds and witch-hunts the world has ever known, is it wise for an individual to free himself from the strains and stresses of a world in crisis and speak out fearlessly for what he believes to be the truth?

It may be unwise to speak out or to write articles on these pressing problems or to take sides on these basic issues, but it seems to the writer that, in a democracy, it is one's sacred obligation to do so. It is in agreement with all that is best in our tradition and hope. It is democracy assuming its responsibility for freedom of thought and speech.

Thus far, we have heard from very few champions crying in the wilderness. In our intense hatred and fear of Communism, we have concentrated most of our energies, attention, and wealth on fighting this danger with the force of armaments. We are meeting Russian authoritarianism with an authoritarianism of our own. By imitating the Russian pattern we are becoming like the Russians. By applying their moods and techniques and heresy-hunting we are turning into the very evil thing we started out to fight.

What does democracy need to save itself? Is it the United Nations, European Recovery program, peace treaties, political reforms, civil liberties, economic justice? All of these are badly needed, but far more do we desperately need an educational program that will develop the moral life of our boys and girls for the revision and recasting of our human relationships.

For this difficult task, we need a drastic revision of our educational program, for education is the one powerful instrumentality that can help us to mend our conduct and sustain the moral life, and therewith the democratic society to which we are dedicated and which we are building. Education can help us to examine and reëxamine our accepted truths. It can teach us to use the resources of the earth without wasting or destroying them. It can teach us to sympathize with people of differing opinions and make us willing to compromise. It can teach us that war is the worst of all evils, that it never solves anything, and hence we ought to dedicate all our resources to the creation of peace. Education can free us from our present spiritual paralysis and open our minds to the impact of new ideas of human equality.

What is the most fundamental problem that the new education must face and try to solve, The greatest fear of man in our present world is fear of insecurity. The great difference between the man of our time and the man of primitive society is that insecurity today is more of a serious menace to the peace of mind of the individual and more devastating to the life of the community and the nation. Insecurity in 1950 of the individual and of the nation is insecurity in an era of economic abundance due to an unjust imbalance in distribution. Carlyle called the insecurity of industrial England "the liberty to starve." Herbert Hoover when he was president called this liberty "rugged individualism."

In Europe, economic security is more desperately needed than in our own country. Its ideologies are colored by the fabulous character of our tremendous productivity and our immediate though not ultimate lack of anxiety about economic security. Without the humility and imaginaton that democratic education can give us to think beyond the characteristic prejudices of American life, we cannot win the ideological battle against Communism.

Today the individual lives in a world of insecurity which destroys his strength of body and denies him through unemployment the moral respect due a worker making an honest living. All the psychologists and psychiatrists cannot cure the mental ailments of man today which are the result of the frightful tensions due to economic insecurity. The main causative factor in most psychological illnesses is due to this insecurity. While there are other causes that tend to these disturbances, even these would be greatly lessened if the fundamental insecurity and inequality were removed. Conditions of insecurity for millions of citizens haunt the councils of state legislators and the national Congress. Business and industry persist in their greediness and are ever seeking government subsidies. The economic structure which ought to provide general welfare becomes, without *social idealism or economic consideration,* a system of insecurity, rather than a wisely planned basis supporting the good life of all the people.

Our weapon against social injustice, the despotism of the rich and the revolt of the dispossessed, must be a new democratic education of the masses, so that the change will come through the initiative and action of the majority and not through the possibility of so-called enlightened and unselfish acts of an industrial hierarchy.

This needed democratic education must grant every boy and girl the fullest opportunity to develop one or more skills. Such education ought to be compulsory. Through this process, theory and practice will become an integrated force which will contribute to the well-rounded growth of the individual. Such education will lift the whole life of the nation to a higher level, make each citizen a productive and self-reliant unit, and thus achieve the democratic goal. There can be no security for any of us except in the highest intelligence, skill, and development of all. In a democracy,

there must be no pushing down millions into the gutter of unemployment but a constant pushing up, pulling up, of all to a place of security and self-reliance.

The outstanding characteristic of the age of insecurity in which we live, in 1950, is that personal and social insecurity have been joined on a world-wide scale. This is the result of two catastrophic World Wars and the present cold war. It matters little if, for a brief time, peoples under a dictatorship attempt to achieve economic self-sufficiency. The wanton destruction of the small gains of security for the individual within the nation under the rule of law, and of the hopeful steps internationally toward collective security under the reign of law for nations, will destroy the prospects of civilization. To thwart the aims of personal, social, and international security is a concession and surrender to chaos. Social justice for the worker cannot be achieved either by fiat or by force. The mere passing of workers' legislation is certainly not the protection of the wage earner; administrations alert and aggressive must follow each act passed. International peace, too, cannot be achieved by force or fiat. The high, pious statement of nations to create conditions of peace under the United Nations does not give integrity to national purpose in the field of international relations, nor does it guarantee that powerful nations will act justly.

The insecurity of 1950 is dominated by the war-madness of the race for international armaments. The race in 1950 is on such a major scale that it threatens to bankrupt the entire world and set us back into a new Dark Age, for there is not enough created wealth in the world to continue this insanity. This age still lies brutalized under the paralyzing aftermath of the last two wars. This madness apparently has not yet run its course and throws a pall of insecurity over all mankind.

It is evident from all this that the processes of education in democracy have not prepared either the individual or the nations to organize the machinery of peace. We educate to destroy. Thus far, this has been the social planning of most of the nations. The state is degraded; the individual is exploited.

Insecurity in its spiritual forms has characterized the Twentieth Century. So far, our economic system has been unable to guide itself; nor has it provided security for the worker; there is no control of the internal relations of nations: war is the accepted course. Nowhere is education the great, forceful effort to make democracy function in terms of individual and social security. The large corporation, as expressed by the management of United States Steel Company, General Electric Company, Du Pont, General Motors, and many others, evidences the denial of that respect which ought to be freely given to the individual as a personality in industry. Management thus far has failed in this acute problem of human relations. As a result, labor has little confidence in management, and the consequences are restriction of output and bitter strikes. The major difficulty in industrial relations today is traceable largely to the fact that management stubbornly refuses to see the implications of the simplest facts about human nature: that human beings are not robots, that people work to satisfy such human needs as food, shelter, prestige, social approval, knowledge, love, and achievement. To achieve these ends, workers must not labor under the threat or fear of unemployment, or for bribes, or under paternalism. Work, to be creative and productive, must be free of any duress. We must teach all our citizens to be sensitive to the anxieties and needs of the multitudes of our people, so that they will not seek escape in the different "isms," drink, or narcotics.

Therefore, education's aim must be the development of the democratic conscience, which will unquestionably grant security against illness and old age with adequate provisions for all of the citizens in a democracy.

The citizen is insecure as a worker because the present industrial system is not able to give him permanent work, or will give him work only at a price. That price is his exploitation as a human being, and the price to society is not paid completely even with this. For the social cost of worn-out, exploited human beings—ash heaps of industrialism—must be paid for finally by the *public* out of huge taxation funds. Hospitals, institutions for the feeble-minded, insane asylums, are all parts of the social costs. Taxation pays for these.

The citizen is insecure in his citizenship because the institutions of democratic government are monopoly-controlled, war-controlled. He cannot give his loyalty to working out life, liberty, and happiness under these unequal Twentieth Century conditions. This is the dilemma of citizenship in an industrial and nationalistic world.

The hunger years since the great depression have threatened the American way of life. This way of life has been a majestic story of an expanding civilization from frontier to a nation of 140 million people. The ideals of freedom, of work, and of character have been built into the social institutions of American life. The enemies of the American way of life in 1950 are the threat of unemployment, disease, insecurity in old age and in childhood. This American way of life must be maintained. The purpose of the people cannot be less than to create in our country the enduring foundations of life, liberty, and happiness for the whole people.

And so we have come to the high responsibility of education. Education must contribute its mighty influence in the effort of these times to maintain and carry forward the American way of life. The primary duty of the educated mind is to assert authority in chaos, to face the present scene realistically and attempt to bring order out of disorganization. Education has social and economic and cultural duties today it has never had before.

The social responsibility of education is only partially accepted in the American democracy. Our legislators of the 81st Congress have relegated this responsibility to a minor role. They have failed to pass the necessary legislation for Federal aid to education. However, the tax-supported system of public education cannot be isolated from the aims of democratic government. Education in a democracy, to maintain integrity in its own aims, must be a creative power in making the system of democracy work. It must encourage creative productivity and coöperation. It must so train our boys and girls morally that they will despise racial and religious prejudices. This kind of development can only be attained by granting our children the fullest freedom of creation, thought, and expression that fundamentally means education not only in fact and method but in ethical values. Be-

fore we can win the intergroup harmony of the masses in our struggle for better human relationships and the American way of life, education must sensitize the moral nature and outlook of the majority of our citizens. The future life of our nation is at stake! There are many large groups within our nation that need democratizing. This process of democratization is at best a slow, gradual process. To meet this number one problem we need:

1. Centralization of our educational system, particularly in our democratic foundations and objectives.
2. Wider educational opportunities for all our boys and girls.
3. A change in our curriculum.

There should also occur at intervals some decentralization when such need arises. People must be granted a voice in the type of education they want and also if at times they want to change the course of education. They must be taught about the foundations of democracy, its goals and purposes. The curriculum must particularly emphasize the spiritual interpretation of history, as contrasted with the material interpretation, and eliminate the present distortions with their legends, their myths, their great battles, their generals, and particularly their financial success stories and their military victories and conquests. We must also equalize educational opportunities and there must be no color lines or political, economic, and religious discriminations. Democratic education must teach its citizens that there can be no freedom without justice and without basic security. To do justice is to extend it into areas of life in which it does not exist or to apply it in a new set of circumstances. If we are to carve out something like justice in a democracy, then we must clothe justice with new dimensions. Democratic education must inculcate in our citizenry a fresh understanding and a new spiirt, and give it power and will to undo injustice and oppose unjust ideas, practices, and unjust people.

The American way of life, in its great traditions and with its great hopes for the future and its present confused insecurity, will be what the American philosophy of education in democracy demands it to be. Education in a world of insecurity cannot, dare not, evade the responsibility of knowing the dangers which threaten the American way of life. Evasion of responsibility is intolerable cowardice in the insecurity of 1950. It will only delay for a brief time the incalculable calamity of a policy of drift. Social values will be destroyed and individual hopes frustrated if a more secure way of life is not soon the American way. If education is to affect American society fundamentally and influence the outside world, it must recast its philosophy, sharpen its skills, and bend itself toward "education for human relations."

Education in a world of insecurity, so confused in the political and economic fields, must fully understand the danger to the American way of life of a present industrial system in which the machine is master. The economic system is imperfect and unstable, is uneconomic when man and his needs are not the master of the machine. There can be no security for the worker in a system where profits are the end of production. The final test of industry is *a moral and spiritual standard.* Does industry make its full contribution through the use of men's energies, enabling them to live the good life? Democracy will not realize this spiritual goal until and unless education will inculcate these spiritual standards into the minds and hearts of its citizens.

Education in a world of insecurity must know the danger to the American way of life in the present mad international scene when frenzied nationalism is the master. Democratic education must clearly show that frenzied individualism and frenzied internationalism are the wrong kinds of development. War is the inevitable result when the minds of men are not prepared for peace. Education in a democracy can and should dynamically take its part in laying the foundations upon which the necessary institutions of peace machinery can be built. The social and economic insecurity of the United States in 1950 is closely linked with international anarchy. It will ever be so, until the world is at peace. Public Enemy No. 1 to the American way of life is *war* and the monopoly capitalism which makes war possible. Public Enemy No. 2 is the ignorance that breeds racial and religious prejudice. Democratic education's challenge is to destroy these enemies root and branch.

The year of 1950 is a year of great economic insecurity and it is also a year of baffling international political insecurity. East and West are at the crossroads of destiny. The great decisions are yet to be made. Will the world remain divided in two power blocs? Shall it be war or peace? Here it is where education can intervene and lead us to a saner civilization. Education has its work carved out for it if it looks into the present abyss of human affairs.

But education must seize upon a more profound danger besetting the American way of life. There is in 1950 a desperate spiritual insecurity in the honest hearts and minds of all who look out with intelligent love upon a bewildered world of fellow human beings. The spiritual insecurity of American civilization can destroy the real America—a land of social idealism and a land of keen zest for living. That is the great threat. The institutions of democracy can only function when there is economic justice, and wherever there is economic justice there inevitably exists basic security. The spirit of democracy is quick to meet great issues only under conditions of creative freedom and when each citizen is conscious of his active participation in the community.

The America of 1950 is insecure in its way of life because there has been failure on the part of education in building a juster and saner world. Here, then, is the high duty of education in a world of confusion and spiritual insecurity. Education can in fresh militancy declare that man's body and man's mind and man's spirit shall not be given in servile surrender to the Twentieth Century machine-ridden, war-ridden and power-ridden systems, but that education should set forth on a long-time, long-planned engagement to create conditions of freedom, justice, and security. Ethical education must become the indispensable and everlasting instrument of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. There is something radically wrong and wanting in an educational system which makes men act the way they do today. Democracy demands of all its citizens the highest form of obligation, viz., *noblesse oblige*, obligation that spurs and urges man to use his innermost and utmost energies for the highest end, solely because his moral nature demands it. It is education's obligation to develop such moral citizenship.

Bible Belt in Cap and Gown

JOHN MALICK

It seems that the worst is over. Religion again appears in the land. The signs: the best sellers, the blurbs, the reviews, the editorials in the big slicks. Something does seem to be coming back whatever its name: Primitivism, reversion, ecclesiasticism again on the march. Something does seem to have gone out, whatever it is called: sanity, common sense, receptivity to likely evidence and generous probability. Whatever it is, the advertising fellows say that it is something a lot of people want all at once. Religious hunger, deepening spirituality are the words used in the book trade commercials. Easy believers are again the vogue.

John Doe looks in at the regular bookstores, reads the jackets to the effect that religion is having her inning: *Study of History, Civilization on Trial, The Seven Storey Mountain, Seeds of Contemplation, Exile Ends in Glory, Peace of Mind, Peace of Soul, The Greatest Story Ever Told, The Screwtape Letters, Brideshead Revisited, The Perennial Philosophy, Razor's Edge, Time Must Have a Stop, Lead, Kindly Light, Joseph and His Brothers, Joseph in Egypt, The Robe, The Big Fisherman.* Some new names have been added for Doe who, vogue by vogue, always had tried to keep up on his reading: Merton, Sheen, Waugh, and Green for the Catholic tradition; Lewis, Sayres, Williams for the Anglicans; Barth, Niebuhr for the new Calvinists; Huxley, Heard, Isherwood and Sheean, for the mystics. Doe is not a specialist in such matters but it sounds to him like the Bible Belt gone "literary" with an Oxford accent, with a dash of mysticism, Oriental flavor, for those who do not take their Western orthodoxy straight.

The matter at issue always is: what kind of universe is it; who or what runs it and what for; how does its large affairs work with reference to man's smaller affairs? "The loneliness of clinging precariously to an impersonal planet, uncertainty of what the next year will bring, the certainty of death," all ask what it all means and where do we go from here. The old situation, always difficult, has been made more so by, "Utopia postponed, Progress no longer inevitable, and science as much foe as friend." Has the new consciousness of security down to grave side increased interest in the longer time security in the universe? To this, religion always has purported to give the answer. Who are the readers that make up this new best seller minority: the disinherited third, sharecropper, migratory worker, little man in the derby hat, lodge, bleacher stadium addicts, Joe Doakes and his union, the church and Hokinson women, collegiates, faculty?

Whatever it is that is coming back, it looks like, sounds like, something that only yesterday was thought to be disappearing by general consent once and for all. Its last stand seemed to be up the cove, in the Bible Belt, and across the track. It was the sort of thing hard to take by those even casually familiar with the findings of the 300 years of the scientific age that followed the longer age of faith without knowledge. It was harder to hold to faith's old answers where the new findings were known than in the districts where they had not heard of the new answers. It seems now that the gap has been closed with religion the same for all, crossroad, hamlet and city block, district school and university center, the same for Southern drawl or Oxford accent. What was thought disappearing suddenly put on cap and gown and proclaimed the same indispensables for sharecropper and faculty.

Doe had spent his life up to now trying to find out what it is all about with reference to himself while here, and after this if he has anything more coming to him. He had taken the word of those thought to know most about what kind of world it is, much of it being beyond his own range of observation or ability to check. He had to take somebody's word for the *new* universe as his ancestors had had to take the word of the religionists for the *old*. If the new one seemed not to be as personally interested in him, happily it showed no evidence of having anything permanently against him. If it is not interested enough to save him, it seems equally disinterested in losing him. This itself was great relief to Doe who always had understood that the old universe lost more than it salvaged. It always had been represented to him that getting through to anything even bearable was extremely difficult while being thrown to the void was easy, likely, and normal. Those not getting through to the happier dead always made the larger statistics. Doe had just gotten comfortably settled in his new universe. There were some things still hard to take when Nature did her rougher work necessary presumably for running this kind of world. However, he had learned to forecast her worst habits and get out of her way. At the worst no intent or animus could be detected. Doe's fear account was much the gainer. A lot of his old scareheads turned out to be gratuitous, conjured up imaginatively before it was known what the real dangers are. The young Does home from college confirmed him. The Professors, too, thought of it that way.

Words of anti-religious import came back that had been used on Grandpa Doe to tell him that he was guiltily ignorant and worse. These words had lost much of their derogatory meaning, having come even to suggest that Grandpa was only a little better informed than the common run. Doe had come to feel that life had given him enough to get through this stage on. Whether this is all coming to him or just a start on something more to come later, he could not tell. Whether he had it in him to save himself for the longer time in the religionist's sense, he could not be sure but had stopped worrying about it. Right or wrong he thought he had it in him to win through to whatever is ahead. He was heartened in this by his own Emerson's venture that whatever is provided likely is up to the great style of all his works. This was more faith in the integrity of the whole scheme of things than the religionists had with their much lower estimate of what is in store for the general run.

This was about the situation for Doe, the average of the modern temper, when, rather suddenly, he was warned again that he was dangerously wrong about it. From Holiness Temple to University Campus came the word that he is in just the same precarious state the religionists always had said. This religious line itself always had done a lot of publishing. In fact, it had the first readers and made the first publishing

business. Most of it in Doe's time was not for his set. They hardly knew that such religious writing was being put out that made about all the reading matter for a large part of the population. It was to the effect, rather luridly put, that he and his crowd were in an eternally bad way and warned them to do something about it. Doe never had been impressed, refused to get excited. It was not the kind of writing that got to him and those for whose opinion he cared. Then, all at once, appeared writing of the some tenor by the kind of people Doe *did* know and evidently intended for them. This new writing came out of publishing houses for which he always had had respect. Their name on a book had been evidence of merit. They put out the books that came to him through his Book Clubs.

This new writing about religion had in it a lot that Doe did *not* know, being himself about illiterate in church matters. He joked with his Rector and Bishop about other things but hardly ever got to "religious" subjects. Here in this new writing were reputed facts and major emphases that long had been stock-in-trade beliefs. Doe himself did not know much about them although they had been taken for granted as sound doctrine by his ancestors since the time of the Roman Empire. This new writing told him through all forms from tracts to *belles-lettres* that he is in a lost state, got here that way, and remains so until he does something to get out of it.

If this new writing is right about it, Doe is just as much, and as tragically, material for missionary activity as is any heathen who never had heard of his lost condition. Doe always had known of it in a general way but never had felt any discomfort. In his time theological writing had been easy to miss and he had missed it. He did not understand the words, never used them. This new writing was much harder to miss. It came to him from angles he never would suspect, came at him "obliquely," in his fiction, poetry, drama, and motion pictures. The religionists called it "oblique." Doe was accustomed to writers getting a message through to him surreptitiously and by stealth, almost unbeknownst to him, some social problem often slipped in among the words, but he was not conditioned to theological matter in his literature. He never suspected the new media of carrying what always had come to him only through his pastor and church paper. Without much difficulty he had missed tract, sermon, and books honestly marked "theological."

Doe did not know that what had come back to him are standardized parts of religion the world around, stage by stage, century by century, irrespective of geographical location. To students of religion it all had been known a long time, all as standardized as the parts in Doe's automobile business. There had been no place in his education where this was given. The schools he attended were permitted to give only the minimum of the history of the time when religion was the master voice and made most of the history. Comparative religion had cleared up the matter but it was a late comer among all the comparative studies. Such knowledge of religions was reserved for the minority in the higher brackets of university study. When religion's worst and best came flooding back, Doe was not prepared for it. It spoke in absolutes that brooked no denial. This itself gave him pause, all absolutes having been conditioned out of him by the new science. Much of the new writing shocked him. His first reaction naturally was, "I did not know that it is as bad as that."

Running through the new writing are some old favorites of the religious tradition that meet the modern temper head-on. One is called the Divine Parsimony. This is to the effect that the High Command finds it very difficult to deal with Doe's kind of life handsomely. This tradition says that anything like desirable life at this stage is only grudgingly granted and any other stage than this almost impossible to reach. In Doe's local religion this parsimony took the form of long gaps of Divine inactivity when nothing was done to retrieve the loss of the race. It made its own imaginary statistics of the majority rejected and a minority rescued from the universal loss. Doe always had wondered about the difficulty of getting out of the Highest Up the small chance man is said to have. He always had been struck by the representation of the struggle in the Supreme Mind between his kind of justice and Doe's kind of generosity.

Part and parcel of the Divine Parsimony is the tradition of an Ascetic Despotism so widespread as to be almost a synonym for religion. This stems from the speculation that the part around here is no favorite of the Creator. There is a rumor, rising at times to requisite belief, that the earth and its furnishings are not from the hand of the Good Power at all, but from an Adversary who made it in the first place or messed it up hopelessly after it was made. Much of creation is represented as a field of danger, more for temptation than for use. The only safe course is to give the whole territory wide range.

Doe grew up in the midst of forbidden things. Each religious group about him had its own special list. This tradition of traveling light on the way to something better was so generally accepted that religion was thought of in terms of what could not be done in safety or in conscience. The most thoroughgoing in *not* using the world went all the way, denying themselves even speech, man's own prerogative and major accomplishment. Few religious bodies gave up all the world but the combined list of forbidden things of all the religionists left little within bounds for the faithful. Doe always had understood that his chances of winning through to something later are quite accurately gauged by, and in about exact proportion to, his disuse of this stage.

Doe had been going around putting the place in order, having been shamed or lured into the idea of getting the best for everybody. This was the part that made him feel right, the part he could do while the professionals were deciding whether it is "religious" or not. He found a lot of top-ranking religionists who confirmed him in what he was doing. So many felt this way about it that they gave the name to an Era, "Social Religion," the man-to-man part of it. The end product was to be a Utopia rather weighted on the side of what more things could do. Things had been so scarce, so long, that no one knew what a better material setup would do. This getting things around to everybody seemed the most creditable thing man had done. Most of it was his own work, helped out somewhat maybe by something inherent in the nature of things that made for Progress, always getting better and better. It seemed that man had it in him to go on improving things indefinitely and save himself for whatever might come next.

This was the situation when the new writing about religion jumped to the best-seller class. If Doe read

it at all, more likely Mrs. Doe did, he was told that what he had settled into so comfortably as religion was not that at all but her oldest enemy. To take the place of this ersatz thing the Does were told what religion always had been and still is if you mean the kind that gets you somewhere for the long stay if you happen to be interested in that. They were informed that hardly an interest of theirs that they had been calling religion is that in fact, if by religion is meant what gets one out of where he is, a total loss, to where he ought to be and cannot get to himself.

The upshot of the new writing is that Doe had been deceived by the same old Deceiver, quite as real a person in the new writing as Doe's Representative in Congress who too often had deceived him. The trouble seems to be the same old Crafty One and his minions who have led the unwary astray since true "religion" arrived on the scene. The only difference seems to be that the Adversary has changed his disguise from serpent to the modern church in which he hides out undetected and unsuspected. The worst effect seems to be that Doe was lulled into a false sense of security when he was in a highly precarious state all the time. "On a razor's edge between Heaven and Hell," is the way it is put. This is a new situation for him, both places having become rather dim.

Doe had ceased to be afraid of his universe. Its worst aspects he could take in the confidence that likely it had to be that way. What it did to him was the common lot. It played no favorites. He knew about the different kinds and conditions of people. What they got out of it varied but the universe itself treated them all "precisely the same." Presumably, they have a common destiny as a common origin. Doe learns from these new writers that what he got in the classroom is not the real story of man. What was told to his grandfather is still the true story, all the new knowledge to the contrary notwithstanding. Such knowledge may be useful for power and gadgets, and interesting enough to the curious, but it is only some special knowledge that counts. It got here in a way of its own. This makes it something not just partly right but altogether right. It is from this special kind of knowledge alone that comes much his professors never told him and with certainty they never claimed. The representation is that there are just two kinds of people, those "out" with the universe and those "in." This being so very important to know it could not be left to man to find out bit by bit, as he got all the rest of his information, but had to be told him all at once, "revealed."

Doe now has two imminent hazards where he had only one before. Of one, just in the offing, he knew and it was worry enough for one lifetime and one world. The tools had been found with which to turn the earth into a shambles and practically end it. Some of his fellow travelers might use the tools. However, this hazard is only problematical. There is still the hope that it might be diverted or permanently delayed. What man made he presumably could direct if he wanted to, *as* he wanted to. He might even use it beneficently. Whether man would do this or end his affairs with the earth was trouble enough.

The new religious writing revived another end of things in spite of all that man can do about it. This end of the present order is said to be in the cards, likely imminent, might come any time but bound to come some time. This destruction of Doe's earth and civilization is said to be as certain as the atomic danger is problematical. *It* might yet be "turned to beautiful account," new benefits never had before. This other end of things of which only the religionists know may not carry benefit to many. The representation always has been that most will lose by it. Doe can come through the general liquidation only if he lets himself be rescued in the only way provided. This end of all things quite soon always had been a must belief in Western religion but had grown dim as the evidence multiplied that the earth is quite fixed in the scheme of things with a long time yet to go before it is closed out as a habitable place.

The only right beliefs are said to be: the lost condition of all ever to be born; one way of escape for all; the divided dead, those who escape and not; believing all this on the authority of revelation, and the relative unimportance of social conditions for the short time here. Doe having been reared in a welfare age and state some of these affirmations shocked him very much. Others did not trouble him. At best they are purely speculative. Against them he can put up his own speculations which seem to him quite as good. The indifference to social conditions strikes Doe unfavorably. The argument is that in such a time as this with two crises impending, the time is too short to give social conditions significance. In the emergency haste, the kind and amount of luggage become unimportant. You can't take it with you. Make for the life belts and the boats which the religionists say they alone provide. Doe has chosen to be a doer of things of which he felt quite sure rather than a believer in things that always struck him as doubtful. The new writers assure him that this is the wrong choice. Fixing things up here and getting them fixed up beyond here are said to be two entirely different matters with no vital relation between them. Only one of them is really in "religious" territory. Doe can see that if they are right about it then his chances are slim enough. What they list as all, and only, important are just those matters he has been low-rating most and working at the least.

Here are two sets of contradictory witnesses on what Doe's chances are. Both represent themselves as experts. He cannot follow either side through all the steps by which it has reached its conclusions. He knows about the documents upon which the religionists depend and the major findings of the scientists. He is impressed with the scientists' kind of evidence. It is just the same in all countries and can be checked any place. They agree upon a certain body of facts, speak a common language that all understand. Their words cover meanings rather neatly the world around. He notes that there is no such agreement on a body of facts among the expert religionists. What is said in one country may be denied in all other countries and cannot be checked for accuracy in *any* country.

Doe wonders how the religionists, both old and new style, ever came to be so certain. They answer all the questions the scientists hardly dare ask and never presume to know dogmatically. Doe looks over this revelation kind of knowledge. It is all in the library and equally accessible to him. He knows just where the religionists get every line of writing for their kind of knowledge. He is struck with the small number of creditable witnesses. Most are only hearsay. Just one here and there said it the first time. All the rest repeated it on the authority of what was likely only his

personal opinion at the time. That is, Doe is not impressed by the revelation way among the ways of getting knowledge. Most that disheartens him is said to have come this way. It always seems heavily weighted on the bad news side. Most of the revealed knowledge he would be glad enough not to know. It tells him how much worse his chances are than he ever would suspect from the regular kind of knowledge. It seems to him that he could have worked out something better himself than any revelation has brought him. Unless he has to, he will not believe that his condition is as bad as the revelation says. The new writers say he has to, or else.

Doe makes what for him is the final test, what does a way of thinking do to his world and to those who live that way? That is, what is the end product of each of these ways, living "as if" it is that kind of setup? He sees the best samples presumably that the new writers have to put up, viz., themselves, products of their way of living. He notes their obsession with sin and what it did to creation, handicapping them from being the men they might have been with a better start. Doe thinks this is greatly exaggerated. Such little sinners, and so few at the time, likely never did that much to such a big universe. He wonders if it knew of their activities down here and revamped the whole scheme on their account. It sounds to Doe like boasting, psychologically a little unhealthy, a kind of exhibitionism. He often had heard fellows at the prayer meeting and in the club car making similarly extravagant claims of being sinners of distinction with wide repercussions.

Doe reads of religion's prize exhibits of his day hiding out to get their precious souls through, making a full-time job of it and then not quite sure. He gets the impression that the universe, too, is almost exclusively engaged for the time being in getting these admittedly chiefs of sinners saved. Doe wonders, tries to imagine, how it would be if all, all at once, decided to follow these examples and all started some morning to put their way of life into practice. He tries to imagine how it would be with all the world gone celibate and silent in obedience to the counsel of perfection for those who would take no chances of missing their place with the happier dead. He tries to see what his familiar world would be like with all gone "religious" all at once up to these prize samples, letting all the good projects die.

It seems that the most likely "lost ones," whose prospects are less than nothing, are just so busy righting things around here that they hardly stop to think whether they have souls or not, certainly never slow down from worrying about them. It seems very clear to Doe which group would be missed the more and equally clear which kind he himself wants to be. These highly commended "religious" samples do not lure him to imitation. Not for the world, not for this world at least, would he be like that.

Doe observes that one group has appropriated the word "religion" to its exclusive use, shelter proudly, even arrogantly, under its coverage. All others have to get along with words of anti-religious or non-religious import. He recalls hazily something running through religious writing of the better sort about what is done for the other fellow being the better part. He remembers all the warnings about forgetting this in vain imaginings about how to get one's self rescued all by himself, here or anywhere. Doe counters with his Whitman, wants nothing that all cannot have on the same terms. While he does not yet know what the universe's own terms are, he has his own ideas of how it ought to be if it is not, and there rests his case.

Theologies Are Selected

MANFRED A. CARTER

We all know that scientists come into the light only when the world is ready for them. Babylonians could not have assembled cyclotrons. Leonardo da Vinci's notebooks were of little value to his too primitive world. The scientists who stayed in Germany were organized behind Hitler to win the war, not to discover abstract truth. Scientific claims in Communist Russia have become a joke to the world, because art and science are subordinated to Marxian propaganda. Even in America, David Lilienthal has his political troubles in atomic research. Early science was born in the monastery but early scientists were often burned for their adventures into the unknown. Pure science has never been really pure. It is odd that we recognize this element of social conformity in scientific research but assume that philosophers and theologians are only selected by divine wisdom, that they are completely free from all human weakness and that the established conclusions of theology are final.

We know that Socrates was executed for refusing to worship the gods of his particular city. The high ethical content of Epicureanism was obscured by gossip and misrepresentation. Even today, hedonism is thought of as monkey morality. On the other hand, Epictetus was a crippled slave who rose to prominence. Could his personal struggle have had anything to do with his stoicism? Marcus Aurelius may have found stoicism very convenient to the problems of administration. Francis Bacon's struggle with debt and vanity did not result in pure speculation. He fought against the blind stranglehold of Aristotelian logic upon the world, but he also went to prison and had his personal weaknesses—inseparable from thought. Descartes said that in order to think it is necessary to be, but in Sweden he died because of an unheated house. His retiring temperament and his thought cannot be wholly separated. Spinoza had to grind lenses in an attic to keep his soul free from the academic world of his day. The atmosphere of hatred which surrounded him could not have been entirely ignored. Voltaire inherited centuries of real doubts, that were definitely related to actual history. Poe, Baudelaire and the Existentialists are more literary than philosophical but they do express a mental reaction against scientific tyranny over the individual, as well as a distorted emotionalism. John Dewey insists now that morality is experimental

and founded upon the facts of our age, not pure reason in a vacuum. William James reminded us that certain schools of philosophy "have too often overlooked the fact that man's thinking is organically connected with his conduct." He would not agree that there is an abstract life of thought completely separate from the practical life of any man. Many psychologists underline the interconnection. It is not easy today to accept the *a priori* of Kant, as separate from the "practical" reason.

We are told that Immanual Kant never left his little city of Koenigsberg to go more than forty miles from home. His teaching experience, his clocklike walk with his umbrella and servant, gave opportunity for the clocklike heart and pure system. But Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, who followed him, took his ideas and tied them in with life. Schopenhauer's stern asceticism was not entirely divorced from his personal disappointment as a rejected lecturer. Nietzsche's mental unbalance and unhappy surroundings are common knowledge, in spite of his cry for a free spirit and his attack on the fear morality.

Is it an accident that Schopenhauer and Nietzsche were immediately subsequent to an era of political revolution, that Emerson's optimism came in a new and growing country, that William James is a product of the era of science? Such men born in other eras, even if they could have had such ideas, would probably have been neglected and forgotten.

William James says that the systematic theologians are the "closet naturalists of the diety." He also says: "Conceptual processes can class facts, define them, interpret them, but they do not produce them." What then is the source of the fact? Is it the practical thinking of the world in reaction to experience?

Psychology has tremendously influenced philosophy and theology. Modern psychologists claim that early psychology failed because it summarized too small a segment of existence. For example, Freudian analysis was limited to a particular class of society in a particular geography. Anthropologists find that varying living conditions in isolated islands produce not only varying myths, but varying emotional patterns. Life and thought are inseparable. For instance, how long will the church continue to talk of a "kingdom" of God and a "prince" of peace when there are no more kingdoms? How long will we think of God the "father" if women rule society?

If these glimpses indicate that life and philosophy are interactive, may it not also be true of theology? The Indian teaching of Nirvana might be the result of centuries of familiarity with starved bodies and painful living. If theology and life are inseparable how did we arrive at our complacent theology of evil and pain? Why does theology accept the inevitability of pain and claim that it is necessary for spiritual growth? Are there unconscious connections with experience? Is there a back door to the ivory tower in which this doctrine was born?

The Communist has said that religion is an "opiate" for the people, and so we do not believe him, but there is a partial truth sometimes in the mouth of the man we distrust. It is true that the church has sometimes served the purpose of keeping the people quiet. For good or ill the Wesleyan movement in England may have prevented another reign of terror, perhaps helped to accomplish some of the same results later. Now the church is accused of keeping the people in "moral thralldom" against change in sex standards, economic relationships, and political growth. The majority in the church has stood with its country in war and against humanity, even giving holy sanction to "necessary" killing. There is more than a desire for law and order back of employer and church sympathy. In these and many other ways the church has often identified itself with the status quo, even while producing the men who would eventually break the status quo. Is there an unconscious connection between the theology of the church and its practice?

One immediately thinks of the social gospel, the liberal teachings of some churchmen, the Federal Council of Churches, and the anger of governmental militarists at many churches and churchmen. There are many evidences of humanitarianism in the church, but far too often only among minorities. Is it not the liberal church publication that has a wide reading? A minister who wishes to stay will preach on personal problems most of the time, and especially about personal joy. The social gospel is here, but not dominant.

Men like to think that their philosophy and theology are logical webs spun in the quiet of ivory towers, but in fact they are written largely by professors in schools that are heavily endowed by the capitalistic powers of today. In the same way that a newspaper editor exercises an unconscious censorship, and develops golf-course sympathy with business, may a professor not also think with the trustees—without realizing that he is so influenced? Or may it be that he simply grew up in that class of society? Of course there are exceptions. Occasionally a radical professor keeps his position, if he is not too radical.

Classicism in art and thought arose out of evil conditions, to escape them, but romanticists brought us back to reality. Victorian simplicities have been broken down by realists. The complacency at the turn of the century has been torn by the winds of terror in two wars. Can theology remain serenely based on the theology of men who lived in a different age?

Psychology has revealed to us the process of rationalization. Men decide by feeling and the subconscious motivation of their lives, and then build up rational systems to support their decisions. Insanity and dyspepsia have played a part in the thinking of philosophers, as have family confusions. Do these extreme cases not point out the fact that all philosophy is diluted by experience? And if it can be demonstrated that philosophy and life are entangled, it may well be that our theory of suffering and evil is historical as well as philosophical.

Let us take one historical church for study, not forgetting the tremendous debt society owes to it, but asking about the relationship of its theology and practice to the progress of the world. The Roman Catholic Church has not been outstanding in its support of liberal reform, even though a large part of its membership is from the class of working men. Capitalism itself is probably a product of early Protestant pietism but it is no accident today that the forces of reaction support Catholicism in various parts of the world. The current swing toward support of Franco in Spain has economic as well as religious force. To take an extreme example, was the Inquisition a religious exercise or mainly an attempt to seize the property of the Jews and Moors? It is no accident that Catholicism in

South America is on the side of the rancho owner. It was very close to southern aristocracy in America before the civil war. It was a landowner and oppressor in France before the revolution, as was the Orthodox Church under the Czars. May we, then, ask how far Protestant theology has really escaped from Catholic theology? We have amended, but have we changed?

We turn to Martin Luther with admiration for his gift of the Bible to the people, but we look back to Augustine and Aquinas for the roots of our theology. These men came after Constantine had given pomp and power to the church. May it be that we now need to go even farther back to the simplicities of the catacombs, to the early church of brotherhood? May we also need a new doctrine of evil, perhaps a fight instead of an acceptance? May it be that our elaborate doctrine of necessary pain is a teaching inclined to maintain the status quo?

Humanism is currently in disfavor, objectively on the grounds that it is a tendency toward atheism, but all humanitarian movements have had to bear some stigma. That label has often been pinned to an enemy of a system of society rather than an enemy of God. Prayers and Bible memorizing, and the singing of most hymns, are not a threat to the status quo, but when we ask what those teachings mean on Main Street, and in the factory or slums, it becomes subversive. Is it an accident that the present United States government is more friendly to "established" religions than to those churches affected by humanism?

It would require a thick book to really prove this theme. A writer would need to investigate the detailed biographies of all our great thinkers, probably need to hunt for submerged facts, not in the accepted biographies. An article can only suggest, not prove, that our complacent philosophy of pain has roots in the status quo, but our intuition affirms it. I have asked a number of fat and comfortable people if they think suffering is necessary, and they agree that it is. But when I talk with people who have really suffered they are not so sure. There are too many suffering people in the world today. The old theory of growth by suffering does not seem to fit.

War is the climax of suffering. We are told to suffer for this and that cause in the name of patriotism, and patriotism has too often been made identical with religion. But people are becoming immune to the war fever. The little people do not understand history but they understand hunger. Perhaps their suffering will eventually reach the theologians and change our traditional ethics and philosophy.

Not only war but all suffering is thrust at us, in the modern age. We see it, hear it and know it. This is one world. But, even in our own communities, older people gradually unlearn the books. Men and women look at their still-born children and are told: "It is the will of God." Young wives lay away their husbands who have died suddenly from brain tumor, or some other tragic disease, and the preacher says it is the "call of God." Young mothers die early of cancer and the family is told to be reconciled to divine will. But years of watching these small dramas give an "eye that hath kept watch o'er man's mortality," and a human heart more sensitive to pain. Centuries of suffering finally change the theories, because men become more sensitive to pain. Theologies are selected by experience. Perhaps the theology of pain is about to change.

Dostoevski's Idiot makes a fascinating literary figure, the thought of a grown man with a child's brain discovering what more sophisticated minds could not, but it assumes the *a priori* truth. Inspired idiots make interesting stories but truth is born in the hot crucible of life, in the mature and experienced minds. Challenge may come from the simple-minded but conclusion must come from a summary of experience. Theology cannot ignore value. Thus the problem of evil is not solved in an ivory tower, but by the study of facts brought us by journalists of war, novelists of economic strife, reporters of life as it is lived.

There remains the element of revelation. Barth tells us it is everything, and there is a present wave of orthodoxy trying to drown all liberals who trust reason. But if revelation were complete and final there could be no progress. Revelation is progressive and it is through the channels of reality. Orthodoxy and institutionalism may temporarily sweep away the battered liberals but they will rise again. As Dr. Johnson refuted Berkeley's idealism by kicking a stone, so the world stumbles over hard facts and revises its theology. There is no longer a quiet university world, surrounded by unthinking peasants. This problem of evil will not be solved in isolation but out in the world. Theologians and theologies are selected by life. There is a desperate need for a new selection now.

Our theories need radical revision. Basic to other problems is the solution of the problem of pain. Humanism dedicates itself to this task, in defiance of the professors of the status quo.

Books Received

ADVENTURES IN SURVIVAL. *By Belle Turner Daiches. Chicago: The Aries Press. 200 pp. $3.00.*

AS A MIGHTY STREAM. *By Julian Morgenstern. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 442 pp. $4.00.*

THE ATOMISTIC WAY. *By Warner Tabb. New York: The Exposition Press. 63 pp. $2.00.*

GARNERED SHEAVES. *By Stanton A. Coblentz. Mill Valley, California: The Wings Press. 224 pp. $2.75.*

LETTERS TO MY SON. *By Dagobert D. Runes. New York: Philosophical Library. 92 pp. $2.75.*

THE LIFE AND TIME OF JEHUDAH HALEVI. *By Rudolf Kayser. New York: Philosophical Library. 176 pp. $3.75.*

THE NEW RENAISSANCE OF THE SPIRIT. *By Vincent A. McCrossen. New York: Philosophical Library. 251 pp. $3.00.*

THE PERENNIAL SCOPE OF PHILOSOPHY. *By Karl Jaspers. New York: Philosophical Library. 188 pp. $3.00.*

A UNITARIAN STATES HIS CASE. *By Robert W. Sonen. Boston: Beacon Press. 149 pp. $2.00.*

UNSEEN WINGS. *Compiled by Stanton A. Coblentz. New York: The Beechhurst Press. 282 pp. $4.50.*

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

SECRETARY'S SCHEDULE, 1949-50

May 6-8: Annual Meeting, Western Conference, Chicago, Illinois.
May 22-27: May Meetings, Boston, Massachusetts.
June 4: Alton, Illinois.
June 7: People's Liberal Church, Chicago, Illinois.
June 12: Indianapolis, Indiana.
June 21-22: Appeal Campaign Committee, New York, New York.
June 27-July 2: Pocono Institute.
July 22: College Camp, Wisconsin.
July 24: Chapel of the Dunes, Gary, Indiana.
July 30: Ann Arbor, Michigan.
August 15-18: General Conference, Portland, Oregon.
August 28-September 4: Geneva Institute.
September 26: Western Conference Board Meeting.
September 28-30: Regional Directors Meeting, Cleveland, Ohio.
October 2: Free Religious Fellowship, Chicago, Illinois.
October 4-5: Michigan—Toledo Conference, Toledo, Ohio.
October 14: Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
October 16: First Universalist Church, Chicago.
October 17: Evanston, Illinois.
October 24-27: Boston, Massachusetts.
October 30: Bloomington, Illinois.
October 31-November 1: Iowa Unitarian Association, Davenport, Iowa.
November 6-7: Duluth, Minnesota.
November 13: Dayton, Ohio.
November 25-26: Geneva Youth Planning Council.
November 27-28: Geneva Institute Board.
December 11: Third Unitarian Church, Chicago, Illinois.
December 16-18: Urbana, Illinois.
December 18: Shelbyville, Illinois.
December 27-29: Ministers Institute, Chicago, Illinois.
January 8: Yonkers, New York.
January 9-12: Boston, Massachusetts.
January 25: Sioux City, Iowa.
January 25: Omaha, Nebraska.
January 26: Lincoln, Nebraska.
January 27-29: Denver, Colorado.
January 29: Boulder, Colorado.
January 30: Colorado Springs, Colorado.
January 31: Topeka, Kansas.
February 1: Kansas City, Missouri.
February 12: Free Religious Fellowship, Chicago, Illinois.
February 27-28: Ministers Institute, Iowa City, Iowa.
March 6-10: Boston, Massachusetts.
March 23-27: Indianapolis, Indiana.
April 16: Bloomington, Indiana.
April 18-19: Appeal Campaign Committee, New York, New York.
April 28-30: Annual Meeting, Western Unitarian Conference, Lincoln, Nebraska.

WHY JOIN A LIBERAL CHURCH?

1. Because in times like these when organized evil is so potent, it is all the more important for the forces of good to be organized to make their impact felt in human life.

2. Because it will give you satisfaction to take those vague impulses for good that you feel all the time and harness them up to a group and a program for action and influence.

3. Because this church does stand for that natural and human approach to religion unclouded by the vagaries of a lingering supernaturalism and a supine other-worldliness.

4. Because in this church neither children nor adults are afraid to ask questions.

5. Because the early grounding in religion which children receive in our church school is of a kind that will not be challenged and discredited by later high school and college experience.

6. Because our kind of religion respects the integrity and ability of men and calls upon them not merely to accept a pre-digested faith but to think and fashion a religious faith for themselves.

7. Because unless we are willing to undertake some responsibility for carrying on and enriching the spiritual heritage we have received from previous generations, we are falling far short of our obligations as citizens.

8. Because, after all, this spiritual heritage is the most important and most valuable thing in life to all of us, and its support and enhancement properly places as one of the first obligations of human life.

9. Because you meet people in church who care about other people.

10. Because this church is on the advancing edge of a kind of a religion suited to a world in which individuals are growing in the direction of intelligence and personal competence and a world gradually evolving a pattern of unity and universal values.

—*Tracy M. Pullman.*

ORCHIDS TO:

Angora, Minnesota.
Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
Duluth, Minnesota.
Jackson, Michigan.
St. Louis, Missouri.
Shelbyville, Illinois.
Virginia, Minnesota.

These churches as of March 10 had met and paid their accepted or suggested United Appeal goals. Rumor has it that Evanston and Indianapolis will be added by April 1. Are there others?

NEW SERVICE COMMITTEE CHAPTERS

Two new chapters of the Unitarian Service Committee have been organized in the Chicago area. A North Shore chapter, centering in the Evanston church, was organized in February. The officers are Mr. Wendall Hance, chairman; Miss Margaret Reid, vice- chairman; and Mrs. Leroy Wilson, secretary-treasurer. In March a chapter of the Service Committee was organized in the First Unitarian Church. The officers are Mrs. Randall S. Hilton, chairman; Miss Laura

Swabey, secretary; Miss Mary Swabey, treasurer. This group represents 54 members.

END THE COLD WAR

Twelve ministers, all members of the Chicago area ministers' group, are preaching in their respective pulpits on the subject "Open the Doors, Mr. President —End the Cold War." After several meetings the Chicago area liberal ministers came to a common approach. The points which they emphasized include:

1. War with Russia is not inevitable. The United States and Russia can co-exist without armed conflict.
2. The current policies of both Russia and the United States are leading toward war. This danger is increased by the campaign of misrepresentation, fear, and hatred promoted by many sections of the press, radio, cinema, and by certain religious groups.
3. President Truman should initiate open, direct negotiations with Russia. These should be a prelude to agreements made through the United Nations to:
   (a.) Break down East-West trade barriers.
   (b.) Create effective peace treaties with Germany and Japan.
   (c.) Effect international control and limitation of traditional and atomic armaments.
4. The United States should recognize the *de facto* government of China in order to facilitate the work of the United Nations.
5. The United States, working through the United Nations, should seek to develop a world federation, open to all nations, based upon law and sustained by protective force.

The ministers who participated in this program were Leslie Pennington, First Church, Chicago; E. T. Buehrer, Third Church, Chicago; William D. Hammond, People's Liberal Church, Chicago; H. I. S. Borgford, Beverly Fellowship, Chicago; Lewis McGee, Free Religious Fellowship, Chicago; David Cole, First Universalist Church, Chicago; Homer Jack, Unitarian Church, Evanston; John Parkhurst, Universalist Church, Oak Park; Earl Engle, Universalist Church, Urbana; Arnold Westwood, Unitarian Church, Urbana; Orville Hepler, Congregational Church, Gary; Albert Harkins, Universalist Church, Elgin.

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION, 125TH ANNIVERSARY

The American Unitarian Association was founded on May 25, 1825. It will be 125 years old on May 25, 1950. The annual meeting will be held on that day. During the week of the May Meetings a special convocation has been arranged. The general subject to be discussed will be "Religion and a New Age of Reason." Among the outstanding speakers to be present are: Governor Adlai Stevenson of Illinois, Douglas McGregor, President of Antioch College, James P. Warburg, editor, Arthur P. Murphy of Cornell, Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., President of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Dr. Margaret Mead, nationally known anthropologist and curator of the American Museum of Natural History.

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE PROGRAM, ANNUAL SESSIONS

The Annual Sessions of the Western Unitarian Conference will be held in Lincoln, Nebraska, April 28, 29, and 30. Registration will begin at 10:00 a.m. on April 28. There will be a short business session at 2 o'clock, followed by meetings of the Women's Alliance and the Midwest Chapter of the Unitarian Minister's Association. The Alliance program will be in charge of Mrs. C. Sidney Neuhoff of the St. Louis Alliance. Rev. Kenneth C. Walker of Bloomington, Illinois, will be in charge of the ministers' meeting.

The Conference banquet will be held at 6:00 p.m. on Friday. Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Dean of Abraham Lincoln Centre and Editor of UNITY, will give the address. Rev. Rudolph Gilbert of Denver, Colorado, and Rev. Charles Phillips of Des Moines, Iowa, will participate in the program. Dr. James M. Reinhardt of Lincoln will be the toastmaster. A social hour and dancing will follow the banquet activities.

On Saturday, April 29, the Conference will hear two lectures, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, by Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs, Professor of Psychiatry, Chicago Medical College. Dr. Dreikurs' subject will be "Psychology for Democratic Living." The forum sessions following the lectures will be led by Rev. William D. Hammond of Chicago. Following the afternoon lecture, the business session of the Conference will be held. At 6:00 p.m. on Saturday the Historical Society will hold a dinner with Dr. Charles H. Lyttle, President, in charge. Mrs. Edgar G. Braun of Detroit, Michigan, will speak on "A Century of Unitarianism in Detroit." Following the dinner at 8:15 p.m. there will be a public meeting. Mr. Clifton Utley of Chicago, NBC radio and television commentator, will speak on the subject "Foreign Policy and the Future of the Nation."

Sunday morning the Conference Service will be held at 11:00. Rev. Philip Schug, minister of the Lincoln Church, will conduct the service. Rev. Carl Storm, minister of the Minneapolis Unitarian Society, will preach the conference sermon. His subject will be "The Conservative, the Radical, and the Liberal Mind." Following the service there will be a coffee hour.

The Board of Directors of the Conference will meet for luncheon on Sunday.

COLLEGE CENTERS WORKSHOP

A pre-conference meeting of the college centers' ministers will be held in Lincoln, Thursday, April 27. Four sessions have been planned, with Homer Jack, Arnold Westwood, Edward Redman, and Leslie Pennington as leaders. They will discuss such subjects as the philosophy of student work, the student program of the Unitarian church, the role of college centers' ministers, and the denomination's responsibility for student work.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee of the Western Unitarian Conference which will report at the Business Session consists of Mr. Nathan T. Ladenson of the Evanston church, Dr. Tracy M. Pullman of Detroit, Michigan, and Mrs. D. Gilman Taylor of Minneapolis, Minnesota.

A SENSIBLE BOOK

Religion Can Make Sense, by Clinton Lee Scott, is a valuable book for any liberal to have. While it is geared to Universalist extension one can use either Universalist, Unitarian, universal or liberal religion and it still makes sense. Order through the Western Conference Office.